DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 801 UD 018 452

AUTHOR Kaufman, Maurice; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation of Project LEAP, E.S.E.A. Title I Program of Medford, Massachusetts, 1977-1978.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 111p.; For related documents, see UD 018 176-177; Appendix pages xii-xxi, copyrighted material, have been deleted; Parts of the appendix may not reproduce well due to marginal legibility of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Language Skills; Parent Attitudes; Post Testing; Pretesting; Program Administration; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Standardized Tests; *Tests
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Massachusetts (Medford); Metropolitan Achievement Tests; Standford Early School Achievement Test

ABSTRACT

This report describes the implementation of the Language Education Acceleration Program (LEAP) of Medford, Massachusetts. The program is evaluated. The administration of the program is discussed. Pre and post test results are given and analyzed for the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Stanford Early School Achievement Test, phonics, structural analysis, psychomotor development, career awareness, and a behavior/attitude checklist. The results of a parent questionnaire on attitudes to LEAP are given. It is concluded that students participating in the LEAP program made substantial gains in word analysis, reading, language, and spelling skills. (Author/MC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156801

AN EVALUATION OF PROJECT LEAP, E.S.E.A. TITLE I PROGRAM OF MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 1977-1978

MAURICE KAUFMAN

ALBERT KOVNER

LESLIE BURG

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maurice Kaufman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

BOSTON

1978

UD015152

CONTENTS

Description of the Program..... 1

Evaluation of the Program in Progress..... 8

Administration of the Program..... 19

Staff Development..... 19

Test Results and Analysis

Metropolitan Achievement Test..... 23

Stanford Early School Achievement Test..... 34

Phonics..... 36

Structural Analysis..... 39

Physical Education..... 41

Career Education..... 45

Behavior Attitude Checklist..... 47

Results of Parent Questionnaire..... 61

Conclusions..... 72

Recommendations..... 74

Appendix

Staff Development Activities..... i

Public Information Activities..... xi

State and Regional Activities..... xix

Career Education/Junior High Transition..... xxiii

Report of Specialists..... xxviii

Cover page is from a photo by Kathie Indigaro of the LEAP Staff

Description of the Program

General

The Language Education Acceleration Program, LEAP, which Medford offers students under the aegis of Title I, E.S.E.A., is clearly described by the Director:

The basic goal of this program is to strengthen the Communication Skills, and the emotional and academic foundations on which such skills are based, of a specified number of children falling considerably below established norms in such skills, who currently reside in the identified target school attendance areas.

The vehicle to realize this goal will be a coordinated and concentrated multi-disciplinary team of Communication Specialists and teachers, federally funded, working in conjunction with and supplementing specialists now at work in the school department.

Our premise is that every child has a right to the full development and natural evolvement of his latent communication abilities regardless of socio-economic, emotional, receptive or expressive, graphic or verbal disabilities.

The Director, together with the Evaluators, Title I specialists and teachers, will identify the priority communications needs of children in the groups.

Specific needs in speech and reading will be met by

specialists in those fields. In addition, Title I teachers will supplement instruction and be supportive of identified children both in the classroom and in small groups and tutorial relationships.

The foregoing Instructional Staff will have as its main responsibility the development of skills in the Cognitive and Affective Domains.

Since communication deficiencies sometimes have roots in social or emotional problems, the program will include a school adjustment counselor who will be available to supplement the work of the regularly assigned school adjustment counselor and the school psychologist. The attention of these existing and Title I services will be focused on Psychological, Social, and Interpersonal Relationship Skills Development.

The Physical Development of the children will be monitored by existing health services of the school department.

Motor Development will be among the responsibilities of the appropriate physical education specialists as prescribed by the school department. The Title I staff will include a Developmental Physical Education Specialist to supplement the work of the school department physical education program.

The list of concerns is long. They form the basis and foundation of the program. The keystone, however, is their effective coordination with existing instructional and related services and their focused concentration on priority needs. This will be accomplished through frequent consul-

tation and cooperation with the Administrator's Advisory Council and the Parent Advisory Council.

TITLE I - LEAP OBJECTIVES

GENERAL

I. COGNITIVE

1. To reduce significantly the numbers of children scoring below the fortieth percentile in language skills on regularly administered standardized tests.
2. To increase substantially the numbers of children meeting grade level norms in paragraph meaning sections of regularly administered standardized tests.
3. To provide supplementary coordinated and concentrated remedial services to qualified and identified children who:
   a. Have scored at or below the fortieth percentile in paragraph meaning on the Stanford Achievement Test given in the spring of 1977 or on kindergarten readiness tests given in May of 1977.
   b. Have been referred by regular teachers or school department evaluation teams as needing further remediation.
4. To focus the attention of all school department services, existing and Title I, on the priority needs of educationally deprived children to strengthen all aspects of their language acquisition skill in

order to realize their highest potential for effective communication.

II. AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

Within the affective domain, activities of the program are directed so that:

1. The child will choose to share with the class, through bulletin boards, show and tell, etc., a project he has completed.
2. The child will use effective communication in peer relationships.
3. The child will listen carefully to directions.
4. The child will carry out instructions to the best of his ability, including oral and graphic instructions commensurate with his maturity.
5. The child will treat other children as he wishes to be treated, acknowledging communication is multi-directional.
6. The child will accept constructive criticism by trying to correct his mistake, rather than by denying the mistake.
7. The child will, through oral communication skills, share his ideas with the class voluntarily.
8. The child will consider his actions and the results of those actions as an aid in making decisions.
9. The child will act in accordance with rules made by the class.

10. The child will give others a chance to speak without interrupting, respecting their right to communicate.

One of the key factors in the success of a project of this scope lies in the skill and training of the Project Director/Supervisor of Instruction. The LEAP Job Description which Medford has developed clearly indicates the responsibilities and qualifications which are required to bring this program to successful fruition. The range of administrative duties included and the establishment of lines of communication and accountability are clear indications of the broad responsibilities imputed to the Director. By the same token, it is because the Project Director has these responsibilities, that it is possible for a totally coordinated and organized approach to be implemented.

It is no small measure of LEAP's success, as discussed in the following pages, that the Project Director successfully meets these responsibilities.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS
JOB DESCRIPTIONS
TITLE I, ESEA

PROJECT DIRECTOR/SUPERVISOR OF INSTRUCTION

Accountability:

The Project Director/Supervisor of Instruction shall be directly accountable to the Superintendent of Schools or his designated Assistant Superintendent. He or she shall also be accountable for compliance with the specific Guidelines for Instructional Services as set forth by the State Department of Education, Bureau of Curriculum Services, in their Title I Syllabus, 4th Edition, 1973.

Responsibilities:

The Project Director/Supervisor of Instruction is responsible for cooperative planning with the Administrators Advisory Council and for supervising and coordinating all aspects of the Instructional Activities and Related Services of the program including, but not limited to, the following areas:

Application for funding
Criteria for approval
Determining eligible attendance areas
Screening personnel
Budget preparation
Educational needs assessment
Development of performance and behavioral objectives and criteria
Evaluation of instructional program in cooperation with the Program Evaluators
Inservice training of program personnel
Coordination of Title I services with all existing LEA services

Planning instructional conditions including teacher-pupil ratios, specific criteria for selection of participants, frequency and duration of activities, special equipment and materials, and location of instructional activities
Determining priority learner needs
Parent Involvement
Non-public school eligibility
Comparability data
Dissermination of information

Qualifications:

The Director/Supervisor shall be certified by the Massachusetts Department of Education in the field of Elementary Education. In addition, the Director/Supervisor shall have earned a Master's Degree plus thirty semester hours of advanced study, have had at least five years' successful teaching experience at the elementary level, and be certified in at least one of the following areas:

Supervision
Curriculum Development
Early Childhood Education
Speech and Language Pathology
Linguistic
Reading--Developmental and/or Remedial

Time Allotment: Full-time administrative and supervisory schedule

Evaluation of the Program in Progress

This section is based on the periodic visits made by the evaluators and information collected by the Program Director. The evaluators visited the program several times each month, held meetings with the LEAP staff and the Parents Advisory Council.

The facilities which housed the LEAP program in the various schools ranged from extremely good to excellent. At the Osgood school new basement facilities were in use. The Title I room had been panelled, partitioned and carpeted providing an excellent instructional area. These modifications resulted not only in an attractive and inviting instructional space, but completely eliminated the acoustical problem which had existed before. The LEAP program at the Kennedy School is now located in a spacious first floor classroom, and at the Swan School screens have been supplied to partition the basement area which is used. In all the other Title I schools continued efforts have been made by school administrators and Title I staff to provide comfortable and pleasant accommodations for the program; these efforts have succeeded extremely well.

The LEAP program continues to provide its staff with a varied and outstanding array of materials, both hardware and software. The Central Resource Center, established three years ago, is very well stocked and fully utilized. As a

result of parent workshops initiated last year and encouragement from staff members more parents are making use of the center than ever before. Most teachers prepare their own materials for specific purposes, and all of the staff seem to use the available materials, including the audio-visual equipment, in appropriate and creative ways to enhance skills teaching and actively involve the children in learning.

An educational program can never be stronger than its professional staff, and Medford's Title I staff demonstrates work of an excellent quality. It has been satisfying to observe the continued professional growth and development of these people over the years. The result is a cohesive group of well educated, creative, and committed professionals who provide high quality instruction and obviously care about the children they teach.

It is notable that this year the Title I staff achieved parity in terms of equal seniority rights and salary with the other regularly appointed teachers in the Medford school system. This is beneficial to the staff and indicates the high esteem in which they are held by the school administration.

Several new staff members were hired for the program this year. These people were carefully selected. All have been interviewed and observed by the evaluators and are performing very well. Presently there is one new instructor at the Columbus School, and two at the Osgood School. In addition, two teachers were employed for the new Career Education component instituted this year for sixth graders. This component is

discussed in detail below.

It should be mentioned here that the meticulous attention paid to record-keeping by LEAP staff members had very evident pay off with reference to the new staff in that they were able to use this information to immediately begin appropriate instruction of the children assigned them. The individual profile charts and folders maintained for each child in the program are thorough and always up-to-date. The staff should be commended for the care and precision they expend on what is generally considered an unpopular, although necessary, task.

As noted above, a new Career Education component was instituted this year for identified Title I six grade students. The major purposes of this program component are to increase career awareness in these students and to assist them in making the adjustment from sixth grade to junior high school.

By February the Career Education teachers had been selected. These teachers worked with all Title I sixth graders on career awareness units. They also tutored selected Title I sixth graders, generally in the area of study skills, supplementing the instruction received from Title I instructors. In addition, they consulted in the two junior high schools, learning what skills the children require when they arrive, and orienting the junior high school staffs to the needs of these incoming Title I students. They will continue to maintain contact and follow-up on the children in September. Informative meetings were held for parents at each of the

junior high schools as well.

Mr. Gregory Martin of the Institute for Career Research provided the Career Education teachers with five consultations. He also met with the Title I evaluators.

The Career Education/transitional component is a very worthwhile addition to the LEAP program. The two teachers hired to provide instruction in this area appear to be well motivated and extremely competent. Our only recommendation at this time is that for next year's program they limit their function to Career Education and junior high school transition. The Director and the Career Education teachers are considering redistributing the children so that each sixth grader would attend one Career Education session per week with a Career Education teacher, and four instructional sessions with a Title I Instructor. This arrangement would seem to have merit. The expansion of the program to include this component is an example of how Medford's Title I program remains dynamic and continues to evolve and grow in a very positive way.

Philosophically and methodologically the program is committed to a language-experience approach to teaching and learning. To assist in the orientation of new staff, one of the evaluators (Burg) presented a workshops focusing on experientially-based instruction. Teachers are now using this approach with great skill and creativity. In line with this, one of the LEAP Instructors, Mrs. Kathy Indigaro, wrote a proposal and received several cameras and a large quantity

of film from the Polaroid Corporation to develop a unit on "Photography: for Title I children at the Kennedy School." Teachers continue to provide a high degree of individualization. Group work is used to facilitate teaching and to encourage children to share ideas and insights with one another. Both modes of instruction are employed appropriately and skillfully by the staff.

There is continued attention to accurate diagnosis of student needs. Staff makes use of standardized tests, evaluator-constructed instruments, and Behavioral Objective Checklists for cognitive, affective, and psychmotor domains. A Self-Evaluation Checklist of Objectives developed by the staff was in use this year as well. This has the positive effect of encouraging staff members to reflect on and assess their own performance in the program.

As reported in the Interim Evaluation (March 1978) a new diagnostic tool was adopted this year. The Brigance Diagnostic Inventory was employed to standardize the administration of the Behavioral Objectives Checklists. The staff indicated that while it is quite helpful in making accurage assessments of children's needs, it requires considerable time for administration. The evaluators have suggested certain modifications for using the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory in the future to alleviate this problem. These suggestions are delineated in the Interim Evaluation submitted earlier and will be adopted by the staff for next year.

In addition to Instructors, certain specialists are included in the LEAP staff. Among these specialists, positions include Remedial Reading Specialist, Speech and Language Pathologist, Physical Education Specialist, School Adjustment Counselor, and Consulting Psychologist. All specialists continue to work very well with Title I children, and provide excellent service to LEAP staff, classroom teachers, and parents. This year the Remedial Reading Specialists worked with children not ordinarily seen by the Instructors. These children were usually more severely behind in reading. They also administered supplementary tests and provided Title I and classroom teachers with written interpretive reports. Both of these functions represent very appropriate uses of the Remedial Reading Specialists' skills. The program specialists have continued to conduct and sponsor workshops for Title I staff. For example, the Remedial Reading Specialists sponsored a workshop at the Edco Educational Collaborative Center in Brookline, and presented a workshop entitled "Creating Individual Learning Centers." The Speech and Language Pathologists presented current research in speech and language development and discussed its implications for school personnel. The Physical Education Specialist sponsored a workshop on "Helping Children Cope with Death and Dying," a topic of current interest about which teachers had expressed some concern. All specialists submitted a detailed report of their work for this year. These may be found in the Appendix to this report.

Finally, all Title I staff made themselves available to parents for individual consultations at each of the target schools several times during the year.

Inservice staff development was again strongly and effectively promoted by the outstanding Director of this program, Mrs. Bettie Miles. This was accomplished through weekly staff meetings, inservice workshops provided by staff specialists (see above) and workshops conducted by specialists external to the LEAP program. As examples of the latter: Ms. Nancy White, Coordinator of Core Evaluation Teams for the Division of Special Needs, and Ms. Edna Newell, Liaison person for inside/outside placements presented a discussion of services offered under Public Law 766, including the most current procedures for obtaining these services; Ms. Margaret Murphy, an Osgood School teacher, conducted a session on Values Clarification, a topic about which she teaches at Boston State College; and Professor Kristine Strand of Northeastern University's Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology conducted a workshop on Language Acquisition and Development in children.

As a result of Mrs. Miles' leadership the staff also continues to participate actively in local and state sponsored professional and Title I conferences and programs. This year the staff participated in the first series of Tri-City Title I workshops. Members of the LEAP staff conducted a workshop on "The Use of Media in the Language-Arts: Innovations in Reading and Language Arts." Through the Title I Dissemination

Project Committee the LEAP program was selected to present the workshop on Staff Development at the State Title I Conference in Hyannis. Mrs. Miles and the program's six staff specialists made this presentation which was very well received. Relevant information was shared with the LEAP staff by members who attended conferences or workshops.

One problem which arose this year concerned the need for the Medford school administration to employ a substitute teacher to replace a LEAP Instructor who had gone on maternity leave. The school system ultimately acted to hire a substitute teacher and this type of situation should not be problematic in the future. The specific case was discussed in the Interim Evaluation Report and the evaluators make a related recommendation at the end of this report.

Medford's Title I Parents Advisory Council (PAC) has been very involved this year, contributing their time and efforts to local, state, and national activities. The following are some of the activities engaged in by this group:

--Medford's PAC Chairperson, Mrs. Nancy Iovanni was elected as an alternate to the State PAC.

--Mrs. Lois Beradi, a PAC member, attended the Conference of the National Coalition of Title I Parents in Washington, D.C. She and the Program Director, Mrs. Miles, met with the Congressman from the Medford district, Edward Markey, as well as with Senator Edward Kennedy's aide, to discuss the need for increased funding for Title I programs in Massachusetts.

--There was a presentation of Title I LEAP PAC activities at the State PAC Conference.

--PAC sponsored a display for "Education Week" at the main library in Medford Square which, through popular request, was continued until Christmas. The theme of this display was "Read a Book with your Child During Education Week" and it exhibited materials developed by children as an outgrowth of books read in the LEAP program.

--PAC sent representatives to participate in the first New England Regional Non-Public School Conference. Mrs. Shannon (St. Clements), Mrs. Reagan (St. Joseph), and Sister Anne, Principal of St. Clements School attended this conference.

--A parent from the Hervey School, Mrs. Frances Berry, conducted a workshop for the LEAP staff and PAC on "Television and the Home: Impact on Family Interpersonal Relations."

--PAC participated in reading workshops sponsored by the Title I Reading Specialists.

It should be noted that PAC members are regularly invited to attend all staff inservice workshops when guest speakers or authorities external to LEAP, are presenting programs.

--The PAC published its first newsletter, "LEAP", in a continuing effort to reach and inform Medford parents concerning the Title I program.

--The PAC met with Medford's new Superintendent of Schools, Dr. D. Pelletier, and Mr. R. Murano, Assistant Superintendent, to discuss areas of mutual concern.

--At the meeting of the Medford School Committee on June 9 Mrs. Owens, a school committee member, commended the work of the Title I PAC not only for its continuous involvement with Title I programs, but also for its efforts in promoting a better spirit of cooperation between home and school.

Parents also attended meetings with the evaluators to discuss the findings of last year's program. And once again, they collated the information from the survey or parent attitudes in the current evaluation report.

As can be seen from the foregoing section Medford's PAC contributed significantly to the LEAP program. Of interest and importance too, is the extent to which this group of obviously committed parents has become increasingly active in communicating with PACs outside of Medford at the state and to some degree, national levels.

As in past years, the community was kept well informed about the LEAP program. The heavy involvement of parents with the program greatly assisted in this effort. Information was also disseminated through teas, open house activities, the "LEAP" newsletter and newspaper articles. Medford's Title I program was written up several times in the Title I Exchange this year, and the Medford Daily Mercury also provided extensive coverage.

The Title I program in Medford has received excellent support from the school administration from the Superintendent to the principals of the participating schools. In addition,

the administrative staff in the LEAP office have performed in an exemplary fashion, maintaining student records, obtaining and distributing tests, instructional materials, and program information in a very efficient way. They are personable and cooperative and help the program to run smoothly.

From the preceding pages it may be concluded that Medford's Project LEAP has evolved to become what the evaluators believe is one of the outstanding programs of its type. At this point it is appropriate to indicate that a major portion of the credit for the development of this program to its current state of excellence belongs to the Program Director, Mrs. Bettie Miles. She is responsible for the qualitative inservice staff development program which characterizes the LEAP program. Through her efforts and leadership the Medford PAC has grown into a knowledgeable, active force for educational improvement. It has been her determination to deliver the best possible services to children which has molded Medford's Title I LEAP into the exemplary program it is. The evaluators believe that the present program, and Mrs. Miles' role in building it, deserve wide recognition.

Administration of the Program

Administration of the LEAP project continues to be of a high order. In the broadest sense, the LEAP program is almost a school in itself and toward that end the program administrator must be concerned with such administrative tasks as curriculum development, staff personnel, student personnel, school community relations, finances, physical facilities and organizational status. In each facet of administration the Title I practices seem to be well designed and well implemented. Briefly: The Title I staff has managed, over the years, to improve both the location and the conditions of the LEAP classrooms; the relationship with the Administrators Advisory Committee has proven effective and productive; understanding of Title I in the community has continued to grow.

Staff Development

One specific strength warrants further comment. As noted in the preceding pages, staff development activities cover a great range of needs and interests. The contributions which these activities make to the total program is not easily measured. But their overall effectiveness is related to the care and attention to detail which is invested in the planning and implementation of this extensive program.

Under the direction of the Project Director, meetings, conferences, workshops, and related opportunities have been

scheduled throughout the school year. (Notices of announcements for some of these meetings are included in the Appendix. Also included in the Appendix are accounts of Medford's frequent contributions to state, regional, and national staff development projects.)

The plan includes a day-long meeting held prior to the opening of school at which time programs are planned, goals of the program re-examined, and names of children reviewed. Early in the school year meetings are held which help LEAP teachers and classroom teachers in target schools to open lines of communication and to share LEAP goals and objectives. Coordination is enhanced by the fact that Title I staff members participate in all building and city-wide meetings. In addition, all teachers and administrators are invited to Title I inservice and child-study meetings. A number of meetings for LEAP staff are arranged with specialists from other parts of the school system. For example, Medford reading specialists help LEAP teachers coordinate Title I activities with the on-going reading curriculum. Other meetings involve Multi-cultural Specialists, Title I Physical Education Specialist, Title I Speech and Language Specialists, Title I Adjustment Counselor, Guidance personnel from target schools, and external specialists in specific fields.

Title I staff members have opportunities to attend local and regional professional conferences. Follow-up

meetings are scheduled to promote the pooling and sharing of current and relevant research.

A measure of the success of the staff development efforts is indicated by the invitation for the Director and certain specialists to present a program at the State-wide Title I meeting in the Spring. (Notice in Appendix)

The range of staff development activities is evident in each of these categories:

1. University courses, seminars, institutes, conferences, and workshops.
2. Inter and intra school programs, activites, and projects.
3. Consultant directed programs--from within the system or from other sources.
4. Production and use of instructional media, resources, and materials.
5. Individually designed professional growth plans, developed with the Project Director and/or other Title I personnel.
6. Professional partnership with other schools and districts and with regional facilities.
7. Combined meetings and exhibits designed for parents and other members of the Medford community.

In all, the Staff Development program is broad based, providing opportunities for specialists and teachers to learn and grow. At the same time, the invitation to other educators

to participate in many of these activities, suggests that the Title I effort is having an effect on the total educational community.

TEST RESULTS AND ANALYSES

Metropolitan Achievement Test Results

The Metropolitan Achievement Test was administered in October 1977 and May 1978. Form G of each test level was used for pretest and posttest. The following test levels were used at the grade levels shown:

Grade 1: Primary I
Grade 2: Primary II
Grade 3: Elementary
Grade 4: Elementary
Grade 5: Intermediate
Grade 6: Intermediate

The number of children who completed both pre- and post-tests is:

Grade 1	107
Grade 2	80
Grade 3	54
Grade 4	85
Grade 5	69
Grade 6	78

Results were reported in standard score units. Raw scores (number correct) are converted to standard series on the Metropolitan tests by using appropriate tables of norms. A particular raw score on one subtest at one level will convert

to one standard score regardless of the time of year the test is administered. In this respect the Metropolitan differs from some other standardized achievement tests in which the standard score is affected by the time of year the test is administered. Therefore, on the Metropolitan, a comparison of pretest and posttest standard scores can be interpreted as indicating improvement in ability: a student who obtains a higher standard score on the posttest got more items correct on the posttest than on the pretest. Tests of significance are carried out on standard scores.

Tables 1 to 6 show the pretest and posttest results on the Metropolitan. In addition to showing the standard score means and standard deviations (S.D.), the tables present the grade equivalent scores (G.E.) that are equivalent to the mean standard scores. This should make the data easier to interpret.

The results shown in Tables 1 to 6 demonstrate that at each grade level the children (as a group) made significant improvement in each subtest. These results were generally consistent at each school where there were ten or more children at one grade level. These results were also consistent with the findings of the 1976-1977 evaluation. It should be noted that first-graders are not pretested in reading comprehension.

Posttest mean standard scores were also examined for their deviation from grade expectancy. This was accomplished

by noting on tables or norms the standard score that is equivalent to the children's end of year grade placement. The attained mean standard score was compared to the standard score equivalent of grade placement by using a t test for a single mean. The results indicate the end-of-year status on each subtest. Significant differences above or below grade placement are noted. Where there is no notation, the attained posttest mean score does not differ significantly from grade placement.

The examination of posttest mean standard scores for deviation from grade expectancy yielded the following results. First graders were above grade placement in word knowledge, word analysis, and total reading; they were at grade placement in reading comprehension. These results surpassed the results obtained in 1976-1977; the results represent a gain of 1.0 G.E. units in word analysis and .9 G.E. units in word knowledge. As a group, first graders made excellent progress and completed the year with excellent reading achievement. Of course, there are individuals who made lesser gains just as there are individuals who made greater gains.

Second graders scored above grade placement in posttests of word knowledge and word analysis. They did not score significantly below grade placement (2.9) on other subtests, although the posttest G.E. in reading comprehension was 2.7. Performance was uniformly superior to achievement of second graders in 1976-1977 with respect to gains as well as to final achievement scores. The gains made by second graders

also appear to be a change in status with respect to the norm group. The final percentile score equivalent to the mean scaled score was greater than the initial percentile score for each subtest.

Children in grades 3 to 6 were significantly below grade placement in posttest scores of word knowledge and reading; grades 3, 4, and 6 were below grade placement on the spelling posttest score. Grades 3 to 6 were not significantly below grade placement on the posttest score in language. It should be noted that word analysis, an area of superior performance in grades 1 and 2, is no longer measured separately above grade 2. First and second graders scored approximately at grade level in reading comprehension posttests; third to sixth graders are now consistently below grade placement on reading comprehension posttests.

The results for grades 3 to 6 are similar to results obtained in 1976-1977 with two exceptions. In comparison to 1976-1977, improvement is noted this year in posttest performance in language (at grades 4 and 5), and spelling (at grade 5).

For the most part, gains made by all grades in all subtests were accompanied by a positive change in status with respect to the norm group. That is, the percentile score corresponding to the mean standard score was higher on the posttest than on the pretest rather consistently. This appears to confirm the superior results of the Title I program.

The major need for children in grades 3 to 6 seems to be in reading comprehension. This will very likely continue to be the major need at these grade levels inasmuch as the selection of pupils for the program is based in part on below average status in reading.

TABLE 1

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Primary I Form G for Grade 1, N=107

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	28.26 6.54	1.3	47.76[b] 9.34	2.2
Word anal.	28.66 5.97	1.2	45.00[b] 7.39	2.2
Reading			42.07 7.34	1.9
Total reading			42.83[c] 6.06	2.0

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly above SS equivalent of grade placement of 1.9 (P<.001).

[c] Significantly above SS equivalent of grade placement of 1.9 (P<.01).

TABLE 2

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Primary II Form G for Grade 2, N=80

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	46.35 6.08	2.1	57.98[c] 7.03	3.1
Word anal.	45.63 6.15	2.3	56.61[b] 7.94	3.3
Reading	39.10 10.01	1.7	54.30 7.75	2.7
Total reading	41.96 8.37	1.9	55.06 6.69	2.9
Spelling	45.25 6.79	2.0	58.08 8.93	3.0

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly above SS equivalent of grade placement of 2.9 (P<.001).

[c] Significantly above SS equivalent of grade placement of 2.9 (P<.05).

TABLE 3

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Elementary Form G for Grade 3, N=54

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	53.13 8.46	2.6	60.91[b] 5.97	3.4
Reading	48.44 10.08	2.3	58.00[b] 7.61	3.1
Total reading	49.87 9.46	2.4	58.57[b] 5.80	3.2
Language	57.51 7.54	2.8	67.98 7.67	3.7
Spelling	56.20 6.11	2.8	62.98[c] 7.46	3.5

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 3.9 (P<.001).

[c] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 3.9 (P<.01).

TABLE 4

Comparison of Pre- and Posttest Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Elementary Form G for Grade 4, N=85

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	62.18 5.55	3.5	67.46[b] 6.48	4.1
Reading	58.35 7.08	3.1	65.08[b] 8.76	3.8
Total reading	58.94 6.69	3.3	65.54[b] 6.87	4.1
Language	64.64 8.38	3.4	74.47 10.21	4.6
Spelling	63.38 8.03	3.5	69.87[b] 8.42	4.4

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 4.9 (P<.001).

TABLE 5

Comparison of Pre- and Posttest Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Intermediate Form G for Grade 5, N=69

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	68.42 6.61	4.2	72.90[b] 6.37	5.0
Reading	64.33 9.57	3.7	72.96[b] 8.69	4.8
Total reading	66.41 7.02	4.1	72.93[b] 6.86	4.9
Language	74.39 6.02	4.6	81.51 6.41	5.7
Spelling	75.29 6.63	5.0	80.01 7.32	5.8

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 5.9 (P<.001).

TABLE 6

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Intermediate Form G for Grade 6, N=78

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	74.33 5.93	5.2	77.77[b] 6.41	5.8
Reading	72.62 7.79	4.8	79.44[b] 8.11	5.8
Total reading	73.59 6.24	5.0	78.71[b] 6.77	5.7
Language	78.54 6.01	5.2	86.12 6.47	6.4
Spelling	79.90 5.96	5.8	84.37[b] 6.84	6.4

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 6.9 (P<.001).

Stanford Early School Achievement Test

Kindergarten children in the Title I program were pretested on two subtests of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test in January 1978. Posttests were accomplished as part of the school department testing program in May 1978. Two subtests, (1) Letters and Sounds and (2) Aural Comprehension were analyzed for evidence of improvement.

Raw scores were used in the analysis because equally appropriate derived scores cannot be obtained from the test. Consequently, results cannot be analyzed for change in status relative to the norm group. Pre and posttest results (raw scores) are compared in Table 7 using the t test for correlated observations. The group of fifty children made significant progress in both subtests.

TABLE 7

Progress of 50 Kindergarten Children on Stanford Early School Achievement Subtests

		Pretest Mean Raw Score and S.D.	Posttest Mean Raw Score and S.D.	t	p
Letters and sounds	Mean	13.14	20.18	11.452	<.001
	S.D.	5.19	5.72		
Aural comprehension	Mean	11.76	18.42	7.988	<.001
	S.D.	5.28	4.64		

Phonics

A test of phonics knowledge was used. Only posttests were administered to 117 first graders. Children in grades 2, 3, and 4 were pre- and posttested. The instrument comprised four subtests and yielded subtest and total test scores. The areas and the number of items in each area are as follows: single consonants (18), consonant blends (19), consonant digraphs (5), vowels (10), and total test (52).

As shown in Table 8, first graders attained near-mastery of single consonants and considerable knowledge of consonant blends and vowels. This result is consistent with their high attainment in word analysis on the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

Table 9 compares pretest and posttest results for grades 2, 3, and 4. Grade 2 made significant progress in all subtests. Grades 3 and 4 made significant gains in three and four scores respectively. The three grades attained virtual mastery of all areas tested. Where significant gains were not shown, initial performance was already quite high. The results demonstrate that the children in the LEAP program substantially developed their knowledge of phonics.

TABLE 8

Phonics Posttest Achievement
of First-Graders (N=117)

Test	Raw Score Mean	S.D.
1. Single Consonants	17.1	1.77
2. Consonant blends	15.0	5.30
3. Consonant digraphs	3.4	1.65
4. Vowels	8.6	2.46
5. Total	44.2	8.60

TABLE 9

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Phonics Results

Scores	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Posttest Mean and S.D.	t	p
Grade 2, N=78				
S. cons	16.8 1.8	17.6 .7	4.035	<.001
C. blends	14.4 5.5	17.7 2.9	6.418	<.001
C. digraphs	2.2 1.8	4.3 1.1	10.334	<.001
Vowels	8.1 2.4	9.4 1.3	5.711	<.001
Total	41.5 9.3	49.0 4.3	9.859	<.001
Grade 3, N=54				
S. cons	17.4 1.2	17.6 .8	1.021	NS
C. blends	17.2 2.6	18.1 1.4	2.638	<.05
C. digraphs	3.6 1.5	4.5 .8	4.596	<.001
Vowels	8.9 2.0	9.4 1.2	1.773	NS
Total	47.0 5.3	49.6 2.8	3.748	<.001
Grade 4, N=80				
S. cons	17.2 2.2	17.7 .7	1.983	NS
C. blends	17.5 1.9	18.5 .8	4.684	<.001
C. digraphs	4.4 1.0	4.7 .7	2.724	<.01
Vowels	9.6 .7	10.0 1.1	3.143	<.01
Total	48.6 3.9	50.8 1.8	4.737	<.001

Structural Analysis

A more advanced test of word analysis knowledge was employed with fifth and sixth graders. This, a test of structural analysis, provided five scores. The test areas, and the number of items in each area, are as follows: base words (8), prefixes (11), suffixes (8), syllable division (22), total test (49).

Results of pretesting and posttesting are compared in Table 10. Significant gains were made by fifth and sixth graders in each area tested. At posttesting, the children had learned to recognize prefixes and suffixes. Further work in syllable division would be appropriate.

TABLE 10

Comparison of Pre- and Post Test Results in Structural Analysis

Scores	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Posttest Mean and S.D.	t	p
		Grade 5, N=70		
Base words	4.0 2.1	5.0 1.8	4.396	<.001
Prefixes	9.4 2.3	10.5 1.4	4.856	<.001
Suffixes	6.7 1.8	7.2 1.1	2.778	<.01
Syllabication	12.2 3.3	14.8 3.0	6.272	<.001
Total	32.3 6.7	37.5 5.7	8.263	<.001
		Grade 6, N=83		
Base words	4.2 1.7	5.6 1.4	7.235	<.001
Prefixes	9.9 2.9	10.9 1.6	3.444	<.01
Suffixes	6.7 1.8	7.1 1.0	2.103	<.05
Syllabication	14.2 4.0	15.7 3.1	4.077	<.001
Total	35.0 6.9	39.3 4.1	6.559	<.001

Physical Education

Most children selected for the special program in physical education were referred by classroom teachers. Details of the physical education program and caseload are described in the physical education specialist's report in the appendix. The children selected for the program were pre- and posttested on a psychomotor development test comprising items in six areas: (1) ball skills, (2) coordination, (3) balance, (4) body image and directionality, (5) strength, and (6) visual achievement. Body image and directionality assessment was used only with first graders.

Pretest and posttest results are presented in Table 11. In general, gains were significant at each grade level.

TABLE 11

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results

on a Psychomotor Development Checklist

Skill Area	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	p
		Grade 1, N=44		
Ball skills	2.4 1.2	3.8 .5	8.689	<.001
Coordination	3.0 1.2	4.6 .9	11.229	<.001
Balance	1.3 .9	2.8 .5	10.729	<.001
Body image & dir.	1.8 .9	2.7 .6	9.890	<.001
Strength	.8 .4	.9 .3	2.852	<.01
Visual Achiev.	.5 .6	1.0 .6	5.364	<.001
		Grade 2, N=24		
Ball skills	1.3 .7	2.6 .7	10.254	<.001
Coordination	2.0 .9	3.3 1.0	7.695	<.001
Balance	1.5 1.0	2.8 .5	6.075	<.001
Strength	1.6 .7	1.9 .3	2.290	<.05
Visual Achiev	.5 .7	1.3 .7	5.894	<.001

TABLE 11
continued

Skill Area	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	p
	Grade 3, N=19			
Ball skills	2.2 1.0	3.5 1.0	6.664	<.001
Coordination	.6 .6	1.8 .4	8.427	<.001
Balance	.8 .7	1.8 .4	6.647	<.001
Strength	1.5 .8	2.7 .6	5.750	<.001
Visual Achiev.	.3 .5	.9 .6	4.609	<.001
	Grade 4, N=17			
Ball skills	2.3 1.4	4.4 1.1	9.414	<.001
Coordination	.5 .8	1.8 .6	6.126	<.001
Balance	.9 .6	1.8 .4	5.339	<.001
Strength	2.0 .7	2.8 .6	5.607	<.001
Visual Achiev.	.6 .6	1.2 .7	3.405	<.01

TABLE 11
continued

Skill Area	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	p
		Grade 5, N=18		
Ball skills	1.6 .9	2.8 .4	7.000	<.001
Coordination	.6 .8	2.6 .7	10.282	<.001
Balance	.3 .5	.8 .4	4.610	<.001
Strength	1.2 .5	1.8 .4	4.267	<.001
Visual Achiev.	1.0 .5	1.4 .5	2.122	<.05
		Grade 6, N=13		
Ball skills	.9 1.0	2.6 .7	7.138	<.001
Coordination	.4 .7	3.0 0.0	14.498	<.001
Balance	.5 .5	.9 .3	3.207	<.01
Strength	1.5 .5	1.8 .4	1.897	NS
Visual Achiev.	1.2 .6	1.6 .5	2.739	<.05

Career Awareness

A career awareness program was introduced this year. The program provided sixth graders participating in the Title I program with orientation to careers and some basic information about occupations and how one seeks employment. In order to judge the effectiveness of this instruction, an instrument was constructed that measured retention of career information that had been taught and that measured the development of positive work attitudes and self awareness. This instrument was administered to 65 sixth graders who participated in the program. In addition, 208 sixth graders who had not participated in the program were tested. Sixty-five children were randomly selected from the 208 non-participants, and their results were compared to those of the 65 participants. A t test for independent observations was applied to the data. As shown in Table 12, the Title I group, who had received the career awareness program, scored significantly higher in the subtest of career information. The two groups did not differ significantly in subtests of work attitudes and self-awareness. Possibly any favorable change in these aspects that might have been produced by the program were insufficient, given the limited duration of the program, to result in significant differences between the groups. A pre- posttest comparison in a program of greater duration may reveal favorable change.

TABLE 12

Comparison of 6th Graders on

Career Awareness

Scores		Title I Group (N=65)	Non-Title I Group (N=65)	t	p
1. Career Information	Mean	2.20	1.49	3.795	.001
	S.D.	1.05	1.08		
2. Work Attitudes	Mean	6.26	6.52	-1.248	NS
	S.D.	1.16	1.27		
3. Self-Awareness	Mean	4.38	4.72	-1.599	NS
	S.D.	1.10	1.31		

Affective Domain: Behavior/Attitude Checklist

With the understanding that growth in cognitive skill is frequently closely associated with the development of skills in the affective domain, the LEAP staff members have developed a superior mechanism for focusing on four aspects of growth in this reas: Self-Confidence, Responsibility, Cooperation, and Interest. Within each of these categories the LEAP team has identified from four to six items which, when observed, will indicate behavior appropriate for that category. For example, self-confidence may be said to be evidenced when a child:

". . . attempts a new task voluntarily
. . . interacts with adults
. . . volunteers information
. . . completes a task independently
. . . expresses his ideas and opinions
. . . interacts with peers."

(The entire checklist is to be found on the following pages.)

Through the attention given to such matters, LEAP teachers not only are able to give substance to rather abstract concepts, but at the same time, may be more aware of a child's behavior and provide experiences which will re-inforce self-confidence, responsibility, cooperation, and interest in a systematic way.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

School_____ Child's Name _____

Title I - LEAP

Affective Domain
Behavior/Attitude Check List

LEAP Instructor
Recording Observation

Elizabeth N. Miles,
Director/Supervisor - Title I

_____

_____

If the child usually shows the behavior indicated in the statement when the opportunity arises mark the statement with a plus +.

If the child usually does not show the behavior at these times indicate with a minus -.

If you cannot make the judgment, indicate N.A. in the space.

We plan to conduct these observations over a period of two years; therefore, please use the two columns between the first two double lines for the pre and post observations the first year and the two columns between the second double lines for the second year.

	Date Recorded			
A. Self Confidence				
1. The child will attempt a new task voluntarily.				
2. The child will interact with adults.				
3. The child will volunteer information.				
4. The child will complete a task independently.				
5. The child will express his ideas and opinions.				
6. The child will interact with peers.				
B. Responsibility				
1. The child will attend school regularly.				
2. The child will arrive for classes on time.				
3. The child will take proper care of the materials and books assigned.				
4. The child will question material that is not understood.				

Medford Public Schools
Title I LEAP
Behavior/Attitude Check List, Affective Domain
Page 2.

Items	Date Recorded			
C. Cooperation				
1. The child shares materials.				
2. The child is willing to take turns.				
3. The child listens to peers.				
4. The child listens to teachers.				
5. The child responds to suggestions as well as commands.				
6. The child asks to assist teachers and other students.				
D. Interest				
1. The child expresses a general enthusiasm for the LEAP program.				
2. The child will be able to select materials of interest to him.				
3. The child shares his LEAP accomplishments outside the LEAP Learning Center.				
4. The child brings related information and materials to LEAP sessions.				

The results of the pretest and posttest of Behavior Attitudes are shown in Tables 13 and 14. Table 13 shows the number of children in each grade who exhibited the behavior. The column marked "Pre" indicates the number of children who exhibited the behavior in the Fall; the "Post" column was completed in the Spring. Thus while only 18 kindergarten children "completed a task independently" (Item A-4) in the Fall, 31 kindergarten children were so identified in the Spring.

Table 14 makes use of the same data but presents it in percentages. Hence, for the same item, A-4, 34% of kindergartners in the Fall scoring may be compared with 58% of the kindergarten in the Spring.

While it will be instructive for LEAP staff members to look at scores for each item, some general patterns are discernible when the items are examined as four general categories.

Self-confidence scores (Items A-; tp A-6) show growth in every grade. Even when pretest scores are relatively high as in grades 2, 4, 5, and 6, the year spent in the LEAP classes increases those scores to 89%, 93%, 91%, and 92%.

Responsibility scores (Items B-1 to B-4), similarly show an improvement in those behaviors which are deemed indicative of students assuming responsibility. It is worth noting that in grades 5 and 6, as students approach the end of the LEAP program, they seem to be able and willing to take on responsibility. The third grade scores may be

indicative of a stage of development when these children can, in fact, be expected to follow through on their work in a manner that is superior to that of the children who are younger.

Cooperation scores (Items C-1 to C-6) show growth at each grade level with peaks in grades 2, 4, and 6. The activities listed under this heading would seem to be essential for success in school and the high scores shown are reflective of the LEAP instructor's efforts to develop appropriate work habits as part of the program.

Interest scores (Items D-1 to D-4) show the greatest difference between pretest and posttest results at almost all grade levels. The improvement suggests the attention which LEAP teachers give to efforts involved in making learning sessions attractive and important. The relationship between interest and learning seems to be a logical one and attention to this aspect of affective learning is well-focused.

The "Interest" category provides one further insight into the progress of LEAP students in the affective domain. In the 1977 evaluation report, discussion of the behavior attitude checklist highlighted scores on two items:

D-3 The child shares his LEAP accomplishments outside the LEAP Learning Center

D-4 The child brings related information and materials to LEAP sessions.

It was suggested that these items might warrant further

attention by both LEAP teachers as well as classroom teachers. A comparison between posttest scores for 1977 and 1978 on these items is revealing:

D-3	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
1977	25%	55%	56%	65%	53%	66%	58%
1978	23%	68%	87%	74%	85%	68%	58%
D-4	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
1977	13%	30%	44%	48%	48%	54%	54%
1978	26%	44%	63%	56%	63%	43%	51%

In ten out of twelve cases 1978 percentage scores are higher. What this suggests is that teachers are able to focus on these items which seem to have a desirable effect on student involvement and growth.

The Behavior/Attitude checklist was devised by the LEAP staff and has undergone regular re-evaluation and revision. It is one of many measures for which the LEAP staff is responsible. While it does not yet have the statistical significance of some of the standardized tests, the general picture it presents is an important aspect of the Title I effort. The time and energy devoted to the affective domain may be said to pay dividends in learning in the cognitive area and to that extent continued attention should be paid to these concepts.

TABLE 13

Comparison of Pre- and Posttest Scores on

Behavior Attitude Checklist

		Kindergarten		Grade 1	
A	Self Confidence	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
	1	17	34	47	84
	2	31	47	87	100
	3	27	41	66	106
	4	18	31	31	73
	5	23	36	62	91
	6	33	48	83	101
	mean	24.8	39.5	62.7	92.5
B	Responsibility				
	1	45	49	101	100
	2	40	41	61	61
	3	35	40	79	92
	4	16	23	45	84
	mean	34	38.3	71.5	84.3
C	Cooperation				
	1	41	46	90	100
	2	37	46	86	97
	3	35	43	76	95
	4	35	42	77	93
	5	24	32	66	87
	6	14	22	44	77
	mean	31	38.5	73.2	91.5
D	Interest				
	1	41	50	89	102
	2	16	31	51	80
	3	16	12	33	73
	4	2	14	16	48
	mean	18.8	26.8	47.3	75.8
# of students		53		108	

TABLE 13
continued

		Grade 2		Grade 3	
A	Self Confidence	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
	1	52	64	29	38
	2	65	74	48	54
	3	57	70	45	49
	4	41	61	18	34
	5	56	66	43	50
	6	69	73	50	53
	mean	56.7	68	38.8	46.3
B	Responsibility				
	1	72	75	53	53
	2	65	65	49	53
	3	63	72	46	51
	4	47	64	39	52
	mean	61.8	69	46.8	52.3
C	Cooperation				
	1	69	75	47	53
	2	67	73	43	51
	3	67	71	47	51
	4	64	70	44	50
	5	64	69	40	43
	6	54	64	32	39
	mean	64.2	70.3	42.2	47.8
D	Interest				
	1	68	76	37	41
	2	53	68	39	44
	3	49	66	27	40
	4	35	48	22	30
	mean	51.3	64.5	31.3	38.3
# of students		76		54	

TABLE 13
continued

		Grade 4		Grade 5	
A	Self Confidence	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
	1	53	76	47	62
	2	64	79	60	67
	3	64	76	59	63
	4	44	68	36	57
	5	65	76	51	61
	6	79	82	60	67
	mean	61.5	76.2	52.2	62.8
B	Responsibility				
	1	70	70	68	68
	2	63	68	66	69
	3	79	80	64	65
	4	54	71	55	64
	mean	66.5	72.3	63.3	66.5
C.	Cooperation				
	1	81	82	68	69
	2	75	79	64	65
	3	72	79	51	62
	4	69	77	58	65
	5	71	75	52	63
	6	60	73	42	55
	mean	71.3	77.5	55.8	63.2
D	Interest				
	1	62	76	61	66
	2	64	80	53	62
	3	46	70	29	47
	4	27	52	19	30
	mean	49.8	69.5	40.5	51.3
# of students		82		69	

TABLE 13
continued

Grade 6

			Pre	Post
A	Self Confidence			
		1	56	66
		2	71	73
		3	61	78
		4	48	72
		5	59	73
		6	71	79
	mean		61	74.5
B	Responsibility			
		1	75	77
		2	70	76
		3	77	80
		4	59	73
	mean		70.3	76.5
C	Cooperation			
		1	77	81
		2	73	76
		3	64	77
		4	65	75
		5	69	72
		6	55	75
	mean		67.2	76
D	Interest			
		1	63	76
		2	62	76
		3	23	47
		4	24	41
	mean		43	60
# of students			81	

TABLE 14

Comparison of Percentages of Pre- and Posttest Scores on Behavior/Attitude Checklist

			Kindergarten		Grade 1	
A	Self Confidence		Pre	Post	Pre	Post
		1	32	64	44	78
		2	58	87	81	93
		3	51	77	61	98
		4	34	58	29	68
		5	43	68	57	84
		6	62	91	77	94
	mean		47	74	58	86
B	Responsibility					
		1	85	92	94	93
		2	75	77	56	56
		3	66	75	73	85
		4	30	43	42	78
	mean		64	72	66	78
C	Cooperation					
		1	77	87	83	93
		2	70	87	80	90
		3	66	81	70	88
		4	66	79	71	86
		5	45	60	61	81
		6	26	42	41	71
	mean		58	73	68	85
D	Interest					
		1	77	94	82	94
		2	30	58	47	74
		3	30	23	31	68
		4	4	26	15	44
	mean		35	50	44	70

TABLE 14
continued

		Grade 2		Grade 3	
A	Self Confidence	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
	1	68	84	54	70
	2	86	97	89	100
	3	75	92	83	91
	4	54	80	33	63
	5	74	87	80	93
	6	91	96	93	98
	mean	75	89	72	86
B	Responsibility				
	1	95	99	98	98
	2	86	86	91	98
	3	83	95	85	94
	4	62	84	72	96
	mean	82	91	87	97
C	Cooperation				
	1	91	99	87	98
	2	88	96	80	94
	3	88	93	87	94
	4	84	92	81	93
	5	84	91	74	80
	6	71	84	59	72
	mean	84	93	78	89
D	Interest				
	1	89	100	69	76
	2	70	89	72	81
	3	64	87	50	74
	4	46	63	41	56
	mean	67	85	58	72

TABLE 14
continued

		Grade 4		Grade 5	
A	Self Confidence	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
	1	65	93	68	90
	2	78	96	87	97
	3	78	93	85	91
	4	54	83	52	83
	5	79	93	74	88
	6	96	100	87	97
	mean	75	93	76	91
B	Responsibility				
	1	85	85	99	99
	2	77	83	96	100
	3	96	98	93	94
	4	66	87	80	93
	mean	81	88	92	97
C	Cooperation				
	1	99	100	99	100
	2	91	96	93	94
	3	88	96	74	90
	4	84	94	84	94
	5	87	91	75	91
	6	73	89	61	80
	mean	87	94	81	92
D	Interest				
	1	76	93	88	96
	2	78	98	77	90
	3	56	85	42	68
	4	33	63	28	43
	mean	61	85	59	74

TABLE 14
continued

Grade 6

			Pre	Post
A	Self Confidence			
		1	69	81
		2	88	98
		3	75	96
		4	59	89
		5	73	90
		6	88	98
	mean		75	92
B	Responsibility			
		1	93	95
		2	86	94
		3	95	99
		4	73	90
	mean		87	95
C	Cooperation			
		1	95	100
		2	90	94
		3	79	95
		4	80	93
		5	85	89
		6	68	93
	mean		83	94
D	Interest			
		1	77	94
		2	77	94
		3	28	58
		4	30	51
	mean		53	74

Results of Parent Questionnaire

Two separate questionnaires were distributed to parents of the children in the LEAP program. One was designed for parents of children in Kindergarten and Grade One; the second for grades three to six. Two questions not included in the former questionnaire dealt exclusively with reading improvements and were less appropriate for these younger children. The results of the questionnaires are shown, by grade, in Table 15. A summary of the results appears in Tables 16 and 17.

Examination of the results shows that parents have overwhelmingly positive attitudes toward LEAP. Question one asks if parents feel LEAP has helped children in reading. The responses in grades two to six indicate that 96% of the parents feel this is true; only 1% disagree. Among parents of younger children, kindergarten and grade one, the percentage of parents who agree is 90%, while only 2% disagree.

Another response which is reflective of parent support may be seen in Item #8: "I think my child should continue in the LEAP program next year if he/she requires supplementary instruction and the program is available at my child's grade level." Ninety three per cent of parents of kindergarten and grade one children agreed. In the upper grades 90% of the parents agreed. A similar question in the

TABLE 15

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

	Kindergarten			Grade 1		
Questionnaire Item	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	19	1	4	59	1	1
2	22	2	0	49	1	7
3	23	0	0	52	0	2
4	21	1	2	57	0	1
5	21	2	0	61	0	0
6	22	0	3	59	0	1
Number of Returns	25			62		

TABLE 15
continued

Questionnaire Item	Grade 2			Grade 3		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	41	1	0	36	0	0
2	36	1	5	29	1	6
3	35	4	4	28	4	5
4	35	1	6	29	0	6
5	41	2	0	35	0	1
6	41	0	2	35	0	0
7	40	1	1	35	0	1
8	40	2	0	36	0	1
Number of Returns	44			37		

TABLE 15
continued

Questionnaire Item	Grade 4			Grade 5		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	52	0	1	41	1	1
2	46	2	5	37	2	2
3	36	8	10	32	8	2
4	32	7	13	30	3	6
5	42	2	8	37	3	2
6	50	0	3	41	1	0
7	48	1	4	41	1	1
8	48	3	2	40	2	1
Number of Returns	54			43		

TABLE 15
continued

Questionnaire Item	Grade 6		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	44	0	2
2	39	1	6
3	27	7	12
4	35	4	7
5	30	2	4
6	42	1	2
7	41	1	4
8	37	3	4
Number of Returns	46		

TABLE 16

Summary of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

Kindergarten and Grade One

	Agree		Disagree		Uncertain	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	78	90	2	2	5	6
2	71	82	3	3	7	8
3	75	86	0	0	2	2
4	78	90	1	1	1	1
5	82	94	2	2	0	
6	81	93	0	0	1	1
Number of Returns	87					

TABLE 17

Summary of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

Grades Two through Six

	Agree		Disagree		Uncertain	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	214	96	2	1	4	2
2	187	83	7	3	24	11
3	158	71	31	14	33	15
4	161	72	8	4	35	16
5	195	87	9	4	15	7
6	209	93	2	1	7	3
7	205	92	4	2	11	5
8	201	90	10	4	8	4
Number of Returns	224					

1977 LEAP evaluation report elicited only 75% of parents in agreement.

Even the question which indicates the lowest percentage of parents who agree shows an improvement over previous years. Item #3 asks parents to indicate whether children are reading more books for enjoyment. Seventy one per cent of parents agreed. In previous years only 62% (1976) and 69% (1977). This reflects not only that parents are in agreement with the item; it also suggests that LEAP staff members are making a decided effort to help parents to assess this factor.

The generally positive attitude to the LEAP program shown by the results of the questionnaire indicates not only general parental approval; it also is a reflection of LEAP activities which reach parents and help parents understand LEAP activities. A copy of the parent questionnaire is to be found on the following page.

The space for comments on the questionnaire was frequently used. A sampling of parent comments reflect overall satisfaction with the program. In many instances, specific teachers are singled out for praise. In all, 72 parents included comments. Some samples:

> "I think that the LEAP program is very helpful to the children. My son has learned to write well and to form all his letters. He has learned a lot from this program and he enjoyed it very much. (Kindergarten)
>
> We feel that LEAP has helped give our daughter confidence and helped her improve her comprehension in reading. (Grade One)

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

1977-1978

Title I - LEAP

Grade - Kindergarten and Grade One Date _____

School _____

Parent Questionnaire

	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1. The LEAP program has helped my child to express herself/himself and to understand what other people say to her/him.			
2. The LEAP program has hlped my child to have a favorable attitude toward school			
3. My child likes the extra help she/he is getting in the LEAP program.			
4. I think the extra help LEAP provides is effective			
5. I think my child's participation in the LEAP program this year will help my child in school next year.			
6. I think my child should continue in the LEAP program next year if she/he requires supplementary instruction.			

Comments _____

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

1977-1978

TITLE I - LEAP

Grades Two through Six

School_____ Date_____

Parent Questionnaire

	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1. The LEAP program has been of help to my child in his/her reading.			
2. I think my child's attitude toward reading has improved because of LEAP			
3. My child is reading more books for enjoyment in or out of school than he/she did last year.			
4. The LEAP program has helped my child to have a favorable attitude toward school.			
5. My child likes the extra help he/she is getting in the LEAP program.			
6. I think the extra help LEAP provides is effective.			
7. I think my child's participation in the LEAP program this year will help my child in school next year.			
8. I think my child should continue in the LEAP program next year if he/she requires supplementary instruction and the program is available at my child's grade level.			

It is not necessary to sign this form but we appreciate your comments:

My son enjoys his LEAP instructor and the LEAP program. (Grade Three)

Yes, I do think that the LEAP program will help my child. Please continue it. (Grade Five)

The program is excellent. I would recommend it highly. The staff is excellent. The program has made my child enjoy school and have a better outlook toward school and himself. (Grade Six)"

Conclusions

1. The LEAP staff conducted an effective instructional program. As shown in the evaluation of test results, substantial gains were made in word analysis, reading, language, and spelling.

2. Instructors should continue to emphasize reading comprehension in grades 3 to 6 and the structural analysis skills of syllable division in grades 5 and 6.

3. Kindergarten children made substantial gains in aural comprehension and knowledge of letters and sounds.

4. Identification and remediation of weaknesses in psychomotor development were successfully accomplished.

5. Initial steps were taken to promote articulation with the Junior High Schools. This was successfully accomplished by the two career education teachers.

6. The program in Career Education/Junior High School transition appears to be a useful addition to the LEAP program (see sections on Evaluation of the Program in Progress and Test Results and Analyses: Career Education). This program should be continued.

7. The Staff Development program seems to be exemplary. It is well thought out and imaginatively implemented.

8. Improvement in the numbers of students exhibiting "desired" behavior in the affective domain was noted. This instrument and concurrent attention to these attitudes should be continued in next year's LEAP.

9. The Project Director, through the development of appropriate communication channels and assumption of administrative responsibility, has enhanced the LEAP effort in Medford.

Recommendations

1. Continued emphasis should be given to reading comprehension in grades 3 to 6.

2. Fifth and sixth graders should continue to receive systematic instruction in syllabication.

3. The career awareness instrument should be redesigned to expand the section on career information. It should be administered to all participants in that program on a pre- post-test basis.

4. The career education teachers should limit their function to career education and junior high school transition. Individual tutoring appears to be unnecessary.

5. The status of Title I teachers as "regular" members of the staff should not affect the stability and integrity of a staff that has worked together well and increased its professional commitment over the years.

Appendix

Staff Development Activities

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT

TO: The LEAP Staff

FROM: Elizabeth N. Miles, Director - Title I

RE: In-Service meeting - Wednesday, September 7, 1977, 9:00 A.M.
Conference Room
Old Medford High School

I am happy to inform you that our Title I LEAP Program for the 1977-78 school year has been approved and refunded. I shall be looking forward to meeting with all of you on Wednesday, September 7, 1977, at 9:00 A.M. for an all day In-Service meeting with Dr. Kaufman of our Evaluation Team. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss and develop ways to implement the recommendations based on the Evaluation of the 1976-77 Title I LEAP program.

Have a happy and enjoyable rest of summer.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth N. Miles

Elizabeth N. Miles
Director of Title I

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

September 9, 1977

To: The Administrators Advisory Council
and
The LEAP Staff

From: Elizabeth N. Miles - Director of Title I

Re: Staff Meeting - Wednesday - September 14, 1977
1:30 p.m. - Olde Medford High School

Now that LEAP has LEAPed again for what I am sure will be another great year, our Wednesday afternoon In-Service Workshops will be continuing. The Title I LEAP staff assigned to your school will be attending a meeting on Wednesday, September 14, 1977 at 1:30 p.m. in a conference room at Old Medford High School.

The purpose of this session will be to cross reference the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory with our Title I LEAP Behavioral Objectives. Staff members should bring with them a list of estimated number of identified children for each grade level (except kindergarten).

Members of our Administrators Advisory Council are welcome at all our meetings at any time it can be fitted into your busy schedule.

Good luck and good LEAPing
in 77/78

B.M.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

October 7, 1977

To: The Administrators Advisory Council
and
The LEAP Staff

From: Elizabeth N. Miles, Director/Supervisor of Title I - LEAP

Re: In-Service Workshop
Wednesday, October 12, 1977 at 1:00 p.m.

The Title I teachers assigned to your school will be attending an In-Service Workshop on Wednesday, October 12, 1977 at the Edco-Educational Collaborative Center, 20 Kent Street, Brookline, Mass. at 1:00 p.m.

This workshop has been planned by the Title I Reading Specialists, Mrs. Marie Melican and Miss Sherrie Wolfson.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

To: The LEAP Staff
and
The Administrators Advisory Council

From: Elizabeth M. Miles, Director - Title I LEAP

Re: Staff Meeting
Wednesday, October 26, 1977 at 1:30 p.m.
Old Medford High School

There will be a meeting of the LEAP staff on Wednesday, October 26, 1977 at 1:30 p.m. in a conference room at Old Medford High School. Staff members should come prepared to discuss:

1. Selection of kindergarten children.

2. Plans for an "Open House" for Title I parents at each neighborhood school.

3. A list of parents contacted because of a request for this on the PAC questionnaire.

4. Development of a uniform form for recording pre/post Metropolitan test information which should be completed.

5. Reports on conferences attended.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

December 2, 1977

To: The Administrators Advisory Council
and
The Title I - LEAP Staff

From: Elizabeth N. Miles, Director/Supervisor of Title I

Re: Staff meeting - Wednesday, December 7, 1977
1:30 p.m.
Ye Olde Medford High School

The Title I LEAP Staff at your school will be attending a staff meeting on Wednesday, December 7, 1977 at 1:30 p.m.

Nancy White, Coordinator of CET's for the Division of Special Needs and Edna Newell, the Liason Person for inside/outside placements, will discuss the services offered under P.L. 766 and the most current procedures for obtaining these services.

I am sure this will be a most informative session.

As always, any interested teachers or parents are welcome at meetings of this type.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

To: The Administrators Advisory Council
and
The LEAP Staff

From: Elizabeth N. Miles, Director/Supervisor of Title I - LEAP

Re: In-Service Workshop
Wednesday, January 18, 1978
at 1:15 p.m.
Room 223 - Old Medford High School

The Title I - LEAP Staff at your school will be attending an In-Service Workshop on Wednesday, January 18, 1978 at 1:15 p.m. This workshop has been planned by Ms. Michelina Phillips and Ms. Donna Paul, the Title I LEAP Speech and Language Specialists.

They will be presenting some of the current research being done in the field of speech and language development and the implications of this research for understanding children's performance in the school environment.

Any interested teachers at your schools are welcome to attend this workshop.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

To: The Administrators' Advisory Council
and
The Title I - LEAP Staff

From: Elizabeth M. Miles, Director/Supervisor of Title I

Re: Tri-City Area Title I - Workshop
Wednesday, March 22, 1978
Centre School, Everett, Massachusetts
12:30 - 3:00 p.m.

The Tri-City Area Title I programs of Medford, Malden and Everett will be conducting an Exchange Workshop for Title I teachers, administrators and PAC Chairpersons on Wednesday, March 22, 1978 at the Centre School in Everett from 12:30 to 3:00 p.m.

A series of five workshops will be offered. Mrs. Kathleen Indigaro and Mrs. Karen Kacamburas, two of Medford's Title I teachers will be conducting the workshops - " The Use of Media in the Language Arts - Innovation in Teaching Reading and Language Arts."

All of the Title I LEAP staff will be attending this Tri-City Exchange Workshop.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

To: The Administrators Advisory Council

From: Elizabeth N. Miles, Director/Supervisor of Title I - LEAP

Re: The Title I LEAP Specialists

Sherrie Wolfson
Maria Malicah
Donna Paul
Michelina Phillips
Maria Labukas
Paul Mattatall

On Tuesday, April 25, 1978 the Title I LEAP specialists assigned to your school will be attending the State Title I meeting in Hyannis with me.

Again this year, Medford's Title I LEAP program has been selected as one of the exemplary Title I programs in Massachusetts.

The component selected as outstanding and worthy of demonstration by the Massachusetts State Department of Education Title I Dissemination Advisory Council this year is Staff Development. Since the specialists play an important part in planning In-Service workshops, they will be participating in the program I am presenting.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

31 St. James Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

April 11, 1978

Mrs. Elizabeth Miles
Title I Director
Medford Public Schools
Old Medford High School
10 Hall Avenue
Medford, MA 02155

Dear Mrs. Miles,

I am writing to request that you attend the Annual State Title I Conference in Hyannis on Tuesday April 25, 1978 for the purpose of making a one hour presentation on "Staff Development." I would appreciate your bringing the six staff people needed in making the presentation on behalf of the Medford Public Schools.

Thank you very much for your willingness to share your experience in this area.

Sincerely,

Thomas F. Donahue

Thomas F. Donahue
Education Specialist
Title I, ESEA

TFD/dl

MEDFORD PAC NEWSLETTER TITLE I

VOLUME I
ISSUE I

LEAP

JANUARY 1973

What Is LEAP?

LEAP is a federally funded program designed to strengthen communication skills. LEAP is the project title for this program which helps children in all language areas; reading, writing, motor skills, listening and speaking. Title I supplements the regular school program. LEAP has been LEAPing since January, 1973.

Target Schools

LEAP is available to students who reside in the following school areas:

Columbus
Franklin
Hancock
Hervey
Kennedy
Osgood
Swan
Tufts

Children who live in these areas and attend the following parochial schools are eligible:

St. Clement's School
St. Joseph's School
St. Francis' School
St. Raphael's School
Immaculate Conception School

Helping At Home

Have your child -- sort silverware or socks; do the measuring as you cook; look up telephone numbers for a family directory; address birthday, get-well, or thank you cards; sort buttons.

Learning is REAL!

Won't You Join Us?

To continue Title I LEAP, the federal law requires that each target school have an active Parent Advisory Council (PAC).

School	Representative
Columbus	Mrs. Grace Hobson Mrs. Jean Spinetti
Franklin	Mrs. Diane O'Hare Mrs. Nina Cincotti
Hancock	Mrs. Lillian Insogna Mrs. Frances Amari
Hervey	Mrs. Margaret Cossette
Kennedy	Mrs. Lois Berardi Mrs. Linda Mahoney
Osgood	Mrs. Maria Cusick Mrs. Kathleen Sodano
Swan	Mrs. Catherine Bates Mrs. Sandra Lacey
Tufts	Mrs. Nancy Iovanni
St. Clement's	Mrs. Emily Shannon
St. Joseph's	Mrs. Margaret Regan Mrs. Anne DeCristofaro
St. Francis	Mrs. Roseleen DelloRusso
St. Raphael's	Mrs. Diane Costello Mrs. Marie Wise
Immaculate Conception	Mrs. Doris Flynn Mrs. Robert Hartigan

Meetings are held the third Thursday of each month at 9:30 at the Old Medford High School.

Won't you come join us for a coffee break-children are welcome!

Call 396-5800, Ext. 310 (Title I office)

Title 1
Dissemination
Project

A Cooperative Project Serving Compensatory Education

Rooms 612-613 Statler Office Building 20 Providence Street Boston, Massachusetts 02116 (617) 426-6324

May 11, 1978

Mrs. Elizabeth N. Miles
Project Director
Old Medford High School
Ten Hall Avenue
Medford, MA 02155

Dear Mrs. Miles:

While this is a short note, it does carry a large measure of gratitude to you for the role you played in making the State Title I Conference the success that it was. The conference was well received by the 450 Title I directors, teachers, and parents in attendance. The time and talents you contributed to this conference were most valuable to others.

On behalf of the Massachusetts Title I community, I extend to you our thanks and appreciation.

Sincerely,

John Neal
Project Director

JN:LL

Public Information Activities

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
10 HALL AVENUE
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 02155

DARYL W. PELLETIER
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

June 12, 1978

Mrs. Nancy Iovanni, Chairperson
Title I Parent Advisory Council
26 Newbern Avenue
Medford, MA 02155

Dear Mrs. Iovanni:

The School Committee, at its Regular Meeting held on Monday, June 5, 1978, voted:

> "That the School Committee commend members of the Title I Parent Advisory Council who come together to develop policy for the Title I program.

The School Committee appreciates the dedication exhibited by all members of the Title I Parent Advisory Council in giving so tirelessly of their time and energies to assure the success of the program.

Sincerely yours,

Daryl W. Pelletier
Superintendent of Schools

dp/s
cc: Mrs. Miles

PARENT ORIENTATION WORKSHOP

TITLE I, ESEA

NOVEMBER 29, 1977

YANKEE DRUMMER INN

Auburn Massachusetts

Sponsored by

State Parent Advisory Council

in cooperation with

Massachusetts Department of Education

Luncheon Opera — 12:15-1:15 p.m.

Concurrent Workshops

Session 3. — 1:15-2:00 p.m.

Session 4. — 2:15-3:00 p.m.

1. Title I Fair — Pedlar

Kalister Green
Parent Coordinator
Haverhill, Mass.

Bailee Weiss
State PAC

2. Rights and Responsibilities in Working with the LEA — Opera

Thelma Dixon
Cleo Trammel
State PAC

Richard Buckley
Title I Director
Brockton, Mass.

Frank Sepuka
Title I Director
Worcester, Mass.

X 3. Reading Seminar for Parents — Tobago

Elizabeth Miles
Title I Director
Medford, Mass.

4. Dissemination Panel — Pineapple

Monica Lashway
Mary Otto
State PAC

Claire Anderson
John Neal
State Dissemination Project

Gerry Peters
Title I
Boston, Mass.

Conference concludes at 3:00 p.m.

Career Education/Junior High Transition

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

10 HALL AVENUE
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 02155

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT

TITLE I - LEAP

November 18, 1977

To: Raymond Murano, Assistant Superintendent of Schools

From: Elizabeth N. Miles, Director/Supervisor of Title I

Re: Proposed Expansion of Title I - LEAP

Here is the background and outline of the proposed expansion of Title I-LEAP discussed with you at a recent meeting.

At present, Title I - LEAP does not extend beyond grade six except that Principals of Junior High Schools and Guidance Counselors are contacted and are provided a list of children who have been receiving Title I services. They are invited to contact the Title I office if further information is needed. Such limitation of Title I services has been dictated by fiscal restrictions, and the desirability to provide a concentration of services lest efforts be so disbursed that they become ineffective. The PAC and the Parent's Needs Assessment results indicate a need for supplementary reading help in the content areas of the Junior High School Curriculum. Young people at sixth grade level in the schools qualifying for Title I also need to begin realistic assessments of job opportunities and entry level skills required for various occupations. Hence, a Title I career-transition team to assist eligible Title I sixth grade students is indicated.

The specific objectives of this component would be:

1. To assist sixth grade students in making the adjustment from grade six to junior high in order to assure a smooth transition.

2. To improve entry level skills for various occupations in all language skill areas (communication skills of listening, speaking, reading, writing and viewing.)

3. To expand the students' occupational career horizons by developing an awareness of various careers and job opportunities.

4. To assist the junior high school teachers in the content area subjects to be more aware of the needs of children who qualify for Title I.

5. To work with parents of sixth grade children in helping them to understand the curriculum of the junior high school.

There are currently 13½ sixth grade classes in six Title I public schools (two of the Target schools services children only to grade 3 or 4.) There are approximately 200 students in these classes.

The two teachers hired for this component of the Title I - LEAP program would work primarily in the classroom on a regularly scheduled basis approximately one hour per week would be spent in each classroom developing awareness of career opportunities. (This part of the program would be an enrichment experience for all children in the class.)

The Title I identified children in these classes would be given additional assistance in applying the basic language skills taught in the Title I Learning Centers. These children need help in applying skills in the regular classroom setting specifically in reading and writing skills in the content areas.

Discussion groups for parents would be conducted on a regular basis.

Estimated costs for this part of the program for the seven month period from December 1977 through June 30, 1978 would be $22,104.00. This amount includes estimated salaries for two additonal certified teachers for 7/10 of the year, plus added health and insurance costs; increased hours for the part-time project secretary to cover added secretarial duties connected with this component; consultant costs in the field of career education to assist in pre-training and implementation of the program; materials for instruction consisting of filmstrips, cassettes, movies, books and consumable materials.

The specific behavioral objectives and basic attitudes to be expected outcomes would be on-going and finalized with the assistance of the Director, Supervisor and the Evaluation Team through a process similar to the model used in our existing Title I - LEAP program.

Instructional Activities for Career Awareness component of Title I - LEAP

I. The teachers shall be responsible for devising and conducting in cooperation with the Program Director and the school principals suitable programs to satisfy the needs of pupils assigned to them. Among the specific responsibilities will be:

A. Assisting Title I identified sixth grade students in making the adjustment from grade six to junior high school.

B. Developing and teaching a sixth grade classroom program to increase awareness of various careers and job opportunities. One hour per week in each sixth grade in the target schools. There are thirteen and a half sixth grade classes.

C. Working with junior high school teachers and guidance counselors for one hour per week in each of two junior high schools to alert them to the academic needs of children who qualify for Title I.

D. Conducting parent conferences to help parents to understand the junior high curriculum and their child's participation in it. One hour per week for individual conferences and group meetings.

II. The teachers will also assist the identified Title I children in grade six with the greatest academic need (based on pre-test standardized scores and the Title I - LEAP Behavioral Objectives Check List) in applying the basic language skills to improve reading comprehension in the content area subjects.

A. There are 93 identified grade six children currently in the Title I program. The fifty of these children with the greatest need will be scheduled for individual help on a pupil-teacher ratio of 1:1. These added sessions will be scheduled on a rotating basis so as to eliminate any possibility of missing time from a key subject area on a regular basis. This will provide extra supplementary high intensity treatment for a total of five Title I sessions per week for grade six students.

B. This instruction will take place in the Title I Learning Center and in the classroom.

C. The instructor will work closely with the classroom teacher as the major goal is to assist the student in applying in the content area subjects the reading comprehension skills taught in the Title I Learning Center.

D. Special equipment will include audio-visual equipment such as Dukane sound and sight viewers and tape recorder.

E. Classroom teachers will be asked to evaluate each student's increased ability to work independently on assigned projects and to complete task assignments on schedule.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Mrs. Elizabeth Miles
Director of Medford Title I - LEAP

FROM: Mr. Gregory Martin
Career Education Consultant

SUBJECT: Outline of Contracted Activities

DATE: March 13, 1978

2/27/78	Introduction and brief discussion with staff
3/2/78	Meeting with staff to deliver and discuss appropriate resource materials
3/7/78	Meeting with staff members to discuss: a. Program goals and objectives b. Activities c. Format d. Implementation strategies e. Evaluation Also review rough draft of initial lesson plans.
3/14/78	Lynn Title I Career Education Workshop attended by staff
3/15/78	Meeting with evaluators
3/21/78	First session to review progress to date on the development of the curriculum package and initial implementation results
Week of 4/4/78	Second session to review complete draft of curriculum package implementation to date
Week of 4/18/78	Third session to review program progress
Time to be Arranged	Fourth session to orient Title I staff to the program
Time to be Arranged	Fifth session to orient sixth grade staff to the program

Report of Specialists

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS

Research has shown that one out of every ten people, adults and children, has a communication problem. Communication, as indicated in the Language Education Acceleration Program, is the focus of the Title I Program.

Listening and speaking skills (important among the program's behavioral objectives) are the first two steps to successful communication and educational functioning. Deficient speech and language skills can impair one's ability to learn, whether in the form of a learning disability or overall low academic performance.

Responsibilities of the speech and language pathologists include, but are not limited to, evaluation of communication behavior and devising intervention programs. At the beginning of the school year, the LEAP speech and language pathologists diagnose problems exhibited by children through formal and informal testing. Formal testing procedures include various language tests as well as tests of articulation competence. Problems may reveal themselves as difficulties in processing language at the level of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics both in decoding and encoding tasks and affecting both the spoken and written forms of language.

The Speech and Language Pathologists develop individual programs of therapy. Children selected are scheduled for once or twice a week in coordination with the programs of other LEAP personnel. Throughout the year, frequent contact and consultation is maintained by the speech and language pathologists with other LEAP staff members and classroom teachers. When a child in the LEAP program has been referred for evaluation by the CORE Evaluation Team, the Title I Speech and Language Pathologists provide input and are often asked to participate in related conferences. In addition, the speech and language pathologists meet with parent to discuss and evaluate the status of their children. Children dismissed from formal therapy after continue on an observation basis.

The speech and language pathologists are also responsible for staff in-service training sessions. Demonstrations of instructional procedures and techniques for developing communication skills in the classroom are presented. The speech and language pathologists also attend state and national conferences in order to keep abreast with current research and programming in the field.

A clinical affiliation program is maintained with Northeastern University to provide training for graduate students in the field of communication disorders.

Donna Paul
and
Michelina Phillips,
Speech and Language Specialists

Donna Paul, Speech and Language Specialist

Statistics - 1977-1978

Number of children evaluated	86
Number of children enrolled	35
Number of children on observation	9
Number of children terminated	9
Number of children continuing therapy	26
Number of parents contacted	15

TITLE I - LEAP

Michelina Phillips, Speech & Language Specialist

Statistics - 1977-1978

Number of children evaluated	109
Number of children enrolled	28
Number of children on observation	35
Number of children terminating	6
Number of children continuing therapy	26
Number of parents contacted	18

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

PHYSICAL EDUCATION SPECIALIST

As the LEAP Physical Education Specialist, I have continued to provide small group and individualized physical education experiences for identified children in the target schools. I see each child once, and where possible, twice a week for a half hour usually in a small group. The activities and skills involved in the sessions cover a broad range of physical education experiences. I work on meeting the child's particular motor needs and also teach them specific sports skills. The LEAP physical education program has continued to serve as a supplement to the existing physical education program and aids the identified children in meeting its performance objectives.

I continued to provide information on Title I children to the CORE Evaluation Team, and assisted them in assessing the children's psycho-motor needs. I also spoke at a number of target school open houses, explaining my role in the overall LEAP team approach. I participated in a workshop on staff development conducted by our specialists at the State Title I Conference. In addition, I spoke at a meeting of parents of learning disabled children on the importance of physical education in the remediation of learning difficulties. I have also made myself available for numerous parent conferences.

The pre and post evaluation device that I used again this year was the psycho-motor development checklist that I developed two years ago. The checklist is made up of modified significant items from the Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey and the Medford Public Schools Physical Education Objectives list.

This year, the criterion I used for selecting children for the LEAP physical education program was a referral from a classroom teacher, LEAP instructor, or a school department specialist.

One of the aspects that makes the LEAP program unique is that we provide the services of a physical education specialist. I feel that physical education is an integral part of the Title I program. The philosophy of LEAP is to utilize a team approach in working with the total child. We have language art instructors and remedial reading specialists to work within the child's cognitive domain and an adjustment counselor for the affective domain. This leaves us with the all important psychomotor realm for the physical education specialist. Studies have shown that children who are experiencing learning difficulties often display gross and fine motor problems as a symptom or as a cause of the learning problem. Due to repeated failures in the classroom and on the playground, LEAP children often develop very poor self-images. By working with these children in small groups, I can help them to develop the physical and social skills needed to function successfully within their peer group.

Paul Mattatall,
LEAP Physical Education Specialist

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Paul Mattatall, Physical Education Specialist

Statistics 1977-1978

Number of children referred	109
Number of children diagnosed	149
Number of children receiving special help	135
Number of children dismissed	15

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP 1977-1978

SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT COUNSELOR

The School Adjustment Counselor remains an important member of the Title I LEAP team. This year, again, many students have been referred to me for school or home-related problems. It is my goal to insure that all students enrolled in the Title I program have a rewarding experience with us.

I believe as an Adjustment Counselor, that all school children have the potential to learn, the capacity to develop relationships with their peers and school personnel, and most important, the right to their own individuality and self-respect.

This past year, I have consulted with LEAP personnel, specialists in our program, and school department staff to insure that all children referred to me are given a positive alternative and care when they are troubled in school.

I continue to attend weekly meetings with school guidance personnel to involve myself with their activities and participate in specialized training sessions when they are offered. If necessary, I will refer parents and children in our program to community agencies when it is indicated. The School Adjustment Counselor acts as a consultant, makes home visits to parents and most importantly counsels children on an individual basis approximately once per week.

In conclusion, I believe that the school environment is important, because it directly influences the emotional, educational, social and physical development of the student. Our Title I - LEAP program has been so successful because we service our students in all of the above mentioned areas. Many children still require individualized attention in solving their school or home related problems. Ideally, this year, I believe that I am closer to my goal of enabling parents and family members to use their own abilities to resolve family conflicts and problems. As an adjustment counselor, I have helped my students and their families to seek and gain energy from services offered by the school, our LEAP program and the community, to strengthen their family unit and equip them to better cope with the daily routine of living.

Maria Labukas,
School Adjustment Counselor

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Maria Labukas, Adjustment Counselor

Statistics - 1977-1978

Number of children referred	48
Number of children receiving specialized services	26
Number of children on observation	7
Number of children dismissed	13
Number of referrals to outside agencies	2

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP 1977-1978

REMEDIAL READING SPECIALISTS

There are three main objectives of the role of the Title I Remedial Reading Specialist: 1) Diagnostic evaluation and prescription of specific children in the program, 2) the teaching of reading to children, 3) staff development and parent education.

In order to accomplish our first objective, diagnostic evaluation and prescription, we begin the year by testing individual children for whom we are responsible. We use the following tests: Woodcock Reading Mastery Test, the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty, and/or the Silvaroli Classroom Reading Inventory as well as our own informal tests. From these test results, individual prescriptions are written and remediation begins. We see children three or four times a week for thirty minute sessions, in small groups or on a one-to-one basis. We are wholly responsible for the reading programs of these children. We usually write an evaluation for each child tested. This evaluation includes test results, test behavior, strengths and weaknesses of the child and specific recommendations for remediation. These evaluations are used at CORE evaluation meeting and are placed in the child's LEAP folder and cumulative folder.

Our second objective is teaching children to read. At the beginning of the school year, the Title I Reading Specialist and the Language/Arts Instructor determine which children have the greatest needs in reading. These children are seen by the LEAP Reading Specialist. We use a multi-media approach, incorporating tapes, filmstrips, overhead projectors, the language master, and language experience in our lessons. Many times, skills such as vocabulary, comprehension, and creative writing, are built into units of study.

Our third objective is staff development and parent education. This objective is accomplished through in-service meetings, parent workshops, open houses and individual and group consultations. In the fall, our in-service meetings included a visit to the EdCo Collaborative where our entire staff had an opportunity to learn about skill development through games and teacher-made materials. EdCo also conducted a workshop for the LEAP teachers, classroom teachers, and administrators on "Learning Centers". In the spring, the PAC participated in our demonstration of the "Visual and Auditory Approaches to Reading". We attended the open houses at the target schools. Another aspect of staff development is individual and group consultation. We meet with the child's classroom teacher to note progress of the child, compare test results and discuss reading materials and methods used. The same type of consultation occurs with the LEA Reading Specialist and L.D. Tutors. We also participate in group consultations with our specialists in Title I since a child may be seen by more than one specialist. At these meetings, we share information, methods, and materials, each stressing his own particular discipline yet integrating all knowledge so that the most suitable educational plan is devised for that child.

During the year, we attended the New England Reading Association Conference and the Mass. Reading Association Conference where we learned new trends, research and materials that have developed in reading. At the State-wide Title I Conference in Hyannis for parents and directors, we spoke on staff development.

Marie Melican and Sherrie Wolfson,
Title I Remedial Reading Specialists

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

1977-1978

Marie Melican, Remedial Reading Specialist

Statistics

Number of children referred	37
Number of children receiving special help	37
Number of children showed gains	35
Number of children that should continue to receive special instruction	19
Number of children dismissed including grade six	16
Number of children receiving CORE evaluations	3
Number of children diagnosed for the year	115

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Sharrie R. Wolfson, Remedial Reading Specialist

Statistics - 1977-1978

Number of children referred	35
Number of children that received help	30
Number of children diagnosed	25
Number of children that have showed gains	30
Number of children that should continue to receive supplementary instruction	17
Number of children dismissed (including grade 6)	13
Number of children that have received CORE evaluations	5